

632A

MILBROOK

AUGUST 20, 1964

(The recording apparently starts in the middle of a sentence)
... this is probably the best way because we assume that all of us
are interested in consciousness and also interested in Gurdjieff.
At least that is the reason that I am here in order to talk about
that.

(There is a one minute blank in the recording).

... maybe since we all know something. There might be some questions
that you have and that could become a starting point instead of mak-
ing this like a lecture because that is idiotic a little. Why don't
we just talk and see what are the particular phases of this kind of
subject that might be of interest. And, if it is a discussion, I
hope that I will not be the only one who talks. What is it that you
know about Gurdjieff? Or rather, that you know about work, work on
oneself? What have you read? Ralph can help because he has been now
a couple of times to some of the New York meetings and he at least
ought to know a little bit of the direction in which we talk.

Ralph Metzner: Well, all of us I think and I have been in the past few
months, have been reading and talking a lot about Gurdjieff and his
methods and learning a lot from that.

Mr. Nyland: What is in particular the kind of thing that interests
when one reads about Gurdjieff and when you read maybe what Ouspensky
has said. Maybe you have read or started to read All and Everything.
Or what have you heard? What is there that perhaps ought to be clar-
ified? That is, if there are questions of that kind, that I may be
able to help you a little bit since I have been in contact with it
for some years and perhaps. because of that, I am a little bit more

familiar with it.

Question: Well, one question that I would like to clear up a little bit, we talked about it -? - in New York. This question has some particular interest to us because of our own work with psychedelic drugs. And that is that there are several references in Ouspensky's book, In Search of the Miraculous, to drugs and to little pills and to methods of separating essence from personality thru experimental means. We did not have a chance to discuss it. I think that would be interested to hear what is your interpretation of those.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think that the reference that Ouspensky makes to the use of a drug is in a very special sense and also it is such a small matter compared to the totality of the teaching of Gurdjieff that it almost is drowned out by it. That is, there is a reference made to it and it was only in connection with the possibility that by means of certain drugs that one could have a state of consciousness in which it would be possible to see what might happen or to view from that standpoint what has happened so that it would give certain, at a certain time for someone who has interested in the possible development of himself, he could then have more sense of proportion regarding his past and regarding his future. That was the only reference made by Ouspensky.

Gurdjieff never made any reference to it himself. Never; not even in All and Everything, not in the second series and not in the third series. There is no doubt and I am quite certain that Gurdjieff has used this in conversation; it has come up but in such a minor form that we never paid much attention to it. After all, it is not something that belongs to work as Gurdjieff defined it. He only made the reference because it has happened that certain people whom he had known, particularly being in India and Tibet, were using certain drugs

in order to bring themselves in a state which would be useful for them in connection with what he could call work on himself. Only for that reason - never separate from it.

But, as I say, it was such a small reference and it had so little value that as far as I remember, and I have known Gurdjieff since 1924, so that there would have been an opportunity for him to mention it if it was really important. I think that Ouspensky picked it up as something that he was interested in because before Ouspensky met Gurdjieff he ~~had~~ did a great deal of experimentation himself, as you probably know. And that as soon as - it was in answer to a question from Ouspensky ~~that~~ Gurdjieff answered. I am sorry to some extent that there is a reference made to it because it is blown up completely out of proportion. It just happens to be there; and, of course, one cannot deny that Ouspensky reports it and, let's hope that he reported correctly. If Gurdjieff himself used drugs, I think we would know it. And, as far as I know, he did not.

Question: I have heard it said that ninety nine percent of the people in India -?- are -?- with drugs. And the only thing that a man like Gurdjieff -?- for quite some time would be interested in what they were doing with these drugs. -?-

Mr. Nyland: He did not. He did not to us. And no reference, as I said, is made in All and Everything. And, after all, that is one thing that we know about as far as direct result of Gurdjieff's teaching as he wrote it up. I say there is no reference that I know in any one of the three series. It may be possible that there is something in the third series because not all of that has been translated, you see, so I would not vouch let's say one hundred percent. But it is very unlikely because if it played really a very definite part, whatever may have happened in India and whatever are the ninety

nine percent I have no way of knowing of course. That people use drugs, that of course, that I know. But that Gurdjieff was interested in it - no. I am almost absolutely certain that he was not. It would be quite contrary to work.

Question: In what way would it be contrary Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Because one starts to depend on the drug. It is very simple. Work on oneself means that I have a reason for wanting to work. That is, that means that I want to develop myself. As soon as I start to put faith in anything and I need it in order to reach a state of consciousness, something in me is atrophied and is not developed any more. I do not know how much you know about work.

Question: About what?

Mr. Nyland: About work according to Gurdjieff.

Question: Could you tell us something about it?

Mr. Nyland: Well, you have read it, you see. And it is much easier if you ask really what it is that you do not understand because then I know what. Otherwise I might even repeat. To talk about the Gurdjieff system or the method of everything that is connected with it, as you know, is in All and Everything. It really contains all and everything except drugs. So, what it may be that is particularly of interest, that I do not know. But, in sum and substance, the idea is that people are asleep according to Gurdjieff; that there is a difference between a sleeping state which is called a waking-sleeping state and a state which he called self consciousness which is compared then with a state of being awake. Work on oneself is simply pursued in a certain form and with a certain method in order to have a chance of waking up and then developing within oneself possibilities partly of maintaining it and partly of having something that Gurdjieff calls I.

Question: Is it possible for a person to wake up spontaneously? In other words -?- on the street without having consciously -?-.

Mr. Nyland: Absolutely right. Accidentally I think many people have that experience that they are awake. It happens.

Question: Then given that, in other situations which can -?- ones environment -?- that are more conducive to waking up naturally. For example, beaches like the open sea, mountains or deserts. Many people have said and experience that places like that are -?- able more frequently to trigger off spontaneous waking up.

Mr. Nyland: I do not deny that. The question is that when it happens accidentally one has an experience. It usually goes away very soon after.

Question: That is true of experiences that come thru your kind of effort too.

Mr. Nyland: No it does not. That is just the difference. If it happens accidentally I do not do anything about it at all. If I make it consciously, I do something. That is the fundamental difference. The position of I is really the core of the matter. It is not a question of being awake. There is a possibility of developing something that is at the present time potential or latent and it is not developed at all. And it is the faculty of objectivity. It is something that does not exist. That people can have an experience of a certain kind and then it is past simply means that there is nothing to hold it.

Question: But having the experience -?- shows possibilities.

Mr. Nyland: It shows possibilities; that is right.

Question: Since most people, the majority of people are not capable of reaching a state of permanent objectivity or permanent consciousness -?-.

Mr. Nyland: Well, can you wait for it? Just sit and hope? When it is accidental you do not know the law. It can happen/ It can happen to day. It can happen ten years from now. How do you know? It is not denying the fact that it exists and that surely many people have had some experience of that kind very often - when we say it is a moment or an event or an experience I do not forget, that is indelibly impressed on one. Of course that exists. All of us have had that. But if it is a question of trying to become conscious, if I do not know how to make it, on what will it be dependent? You see, the difference is that I become active regarding the wish to become conscious. And, at the same time when I become conscious, that there is something that can be there while I am conscious. If you could invent a drug that develops an I, it would be wonderful. I doubt it very much because that would be the state now, tonight.

Question: That would certainly change things, wouldn't it?

Mr. Nyland: I do not know if it would change it. It would be interesting as an experience for oneself. If it would change it, depends entirely on how many people would be like that and if, at such a point, there would be a possibility of communication. It is still quite problematical. So far, states of consciousness, when they are artificially induced or when they are made because of ones own effort are a little bit separated from the different people who do it so that the communication among them, even those who may because of certain work become conscious, it is difficult to find a language.

Question: What do you mean by the word artifical or artificially induced?

Mr. Nyland: Artificial? I mean by means of drugs.

Question: Would you put plants in the category of artifacts?

Mr. Nyland: Plants are not comparable to man.

Question: Plants are food.

Mr. Nyland: Plants as a food, of course. Do you mean when we eat plants? It is a food. It does not matter; it comes from plants. Whatever it is, it is a chemical. It does not matter; it is a form of food.

Question: Then would it be artificial?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I believe so.

Question: Have you tested these various (?drugs?)

Mr. Nyland: No, I do not want to. No, I do not see any reason for it.

Question: I have a question which I have asked many, many people in the past four years and I would like very much to have your answer on it. It seems to be true that drugs, psychedelic drugs are not part of Gurdjieff's method or his system. But, in the last thirty years, in the last fifteen years, the last five years interest and experimentation in the effects of consciousness expanding drugs of course has increased tremendously. What place do you think that these drugs, psychedelic drugs like LSD as opposed of course to opium and narcotics, what place as such do you think that could have in the spiritual path or in expanding consciousness or in helping man to use more of his consciousness from moment to moment? What should we do with them?

Mr. Nyland: That is quite -?. That is interesting, isn't it? When I discover something in a chemical way and I find a substance that might be useful lets say as a protective coating, then I try to apply it as a protective coating and make a paint out of it. Well, maybe I do not know for a long time what to do with it. Still, they remain interesting from a scientific standpoint and that undoubtedly, by means of trying to continue research on it, one would discover more and more certain things that could be of use. That of course I do not know. No one knows really. Anyone who is interested in

and having them ~~make~~ to make them and so forth would become interested and find a use for it. The only thing is that I am not interested in that. I do not see why I should be.

We are interested of course in reaching states of consciousness. That I think is a logical assumption for anyone who believes that there is a possibility of growth for man and that he ought to have the chance or also ~~make~~ ought to be able to create conditions in which he could grow or evolve in that sense. I think it is quite logical that anyone looking at his own life and looking at the possibility of a spiritual development and whatever may be defined by a spiritual development, that is, if he starts and starts out that he has a perfect right to find all different ways of reaching something of a different level if one could call it a higher level, but, in any event, a different level simply because he believes that and experiences that the way he lives, he is not really the way he should be.

I think that people are at the present time very much bound by the way they are living or maybe as a result of culture or as a result of education; whatever it may be, that he certainly is not free and that the wish to become conscious is really a wish to have freedom.

Gurdjieff definitely is interested in that particular kind of possibility. And, as you know, there is much more about how he starts to define it when he says that man is only a physical body and has a beginning of a Kestjianian Body, which is called Kedjan, and that he really has no Soul; and that if he knew how to work on himself, that there is for him the possibility of becoming different kinds of man which Ouspensky calls four and five and six and seven; and that conscious man would be man number seven. So that evolution simply is in the direction of how can I grow and continue to grow instead of staying where I am. And it is still quite an open question of: If

I can get it easier,

I can reach a state of consciousness by certain means which will not require on my part a tremendous amount of work, that I would be very much tempted to try to reach it.

Question: I think, at this point, we should introduce some more information which would change the level of the discussion around. Because, you see, over four years ago a group of us at Harvard, all of whom were essentially materialistic scientists, psychologists for the most part, some psychiatrists, began investigating the use of psychedelic drugs. And we gave them to a wide variety of people and members of our project which three years ago numbered over thirty five, people of professional level who had a wide variety of backgrounds. We were astonished to discover that a high percentage of the people who took these drugs like LSD, while they all said they could not describe it in words, but when we encouraged them to talk or when we gave them questionnaires to help them systematize their reactions, a very high percentage reported their experiences in religious terms; and not in secular, denominational religious terms but in the language of classical mysticism both east and west. I think in one study over sixty percent of the subjects reported it as a religious experience. And this includes convicts in a state prison who were illiterate, by definition immoral, by attitude cynical and very unlikely to admit to such tender emotions as the religious. After about a year and a half, of course we were completely puzzled by this. Psychiatry has almost no place for religion, in classical, modern psychology, either behaviouristic or psychoanalytic. The first thing we did was we went to the psychiatrists and we said, "You are the experts in consciousness" because psychoanalysts consider that everything that has been written about consciousness and unconsciousness is by Freud --?-- They said that what you are finding are psychotic experiences. It is all in Freud, primary processes. We are not interested in these drugs

except maybe they should be used for research because maybe we will find out more about schizophrenia and so forth but it should be done in a mental hospital. And we reported to the psychiatrists that over sixty percent of the people in our studies and in studies which had been done in Menlo Park and studies which had been done in California in Los Angeles and studies which had been done in Canada and so forth, reported that almost sixty percent, in some cases seventy percent, reported that their lives were changed for the better by the use of drugs. And then the psychiatrists say, "It is impossible; that there are no short cuts to mental health; that there has to be psychoanalysis in which a trained person makes you analyze step by step back to the roots of your problem and there is no way that that can be avoided." So, we were very discouraged. And we of course had talked to the psychiatrists so we talked to psychologists. Psychologists are interested almost exclusively in behaviour, except for the Freudian psychologists and clinical psychologists who would give the same answer that the psychiatrists did. So, when we talked to the behavioral psychologists and some of the most famous in the world are at Harvard, Skinner and his group, they had no interest at all. "It was a figment of the imagination; it was subjective; it is not scientific; it does not exist." We found no help there. Then after, we had these religious ~~exp~~ results. We had been working with some of the divinity professors at Harvard. Aldous Huxley had been at MIT at -?-, and helped us set it up. -?-, Smith, Walter Crock, -?-, a group of about eight or ten of these people had become interested. They called a group of theologians, philosophers of religion and some divinity graduate students from Harvard -?-, and from other colleges and we met and -?-. And I described and Ralph was there and some of the members of our group described our experiences. And we said to them, "We do not understand this. Why should a drug produce in so many subjects the effect that

they say they had a deep religious experience and they said that their lives had been changed. Why do they use religious terminology?" And we said to the theologans very much as we are saing in essence to you tonight, you know, "Help us. You have been studying for twenty or thirty years or more. How can we research this? What kind of language should we use? How can it be tested? And eventually, of course, the question that we all have in our mind; If and how these can be used to help man in the spiritual path because you cannot argue that most great religious leaders have said that the goals are all the same: the objective I or to strip away the subjective self and so on. -?- as to where the spiritual path leads. So, when you said tonight that you are not interested in psychedelic drugs, I took that as a friendly challenge because I think that many of us feel that there is something here that should interest you. And selfishly we hope you will become interested because to the extent that you could listen to our questions and look over our data and learn something about our methods, I think you are in a position to help us. And after we talked to the group of theologians at -?- a wonderful thing developed. There was an ad hoc informal discussion group which developed and for I think three years, just about three years -?- the first Sunday of each month. And it is still meeting today in the Cambridge area. And this group did help us in many of the questions and -?- which we raised. For example, it did encourage and support some research and a study which grow out of these Sunday night meetings with the theologians which has been reported widely in both the scientific and the secular press. It was called the Good Friday study in which thirty people in Boston University Chapel took psychedelic drugs on Good Friday at twelve o'clock and scientifically proved and, to use to jargon of statistics and significant differences, that psychedelic drugs, given in a religious and serious end, I would say, sacred setting, could ~~provide~~ provide with

the strictest scientific control -?- could provide a religious experience. So, it is obvious that in each generation, as new facts develop and as new scientific studies are made, that we will learn more about the nervous system; we will learn more about man's total functioning and that it might be possible, not to speed up the growth process, but to knock out some of the blocks which prevent it from happening naturally. -??- if it were not for some of the educational and political pressures which prevent us from growing as we might have.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I understand. I understand very well. What I mean when I said I am not interested, it does not mean that it isn't interesting. You know, there are many things that are of interest and also that I consider very interesting. Sometimes it is a matter of time. Sometimes it is also something that belongs to someone else and I still would remain interested to see what might happen. But when it comes to a question of trying to find out what is really the crux of the problem of reaching a state of consciousness, I have to select out of the different kinds of religions and dogmas and whatever prescriptions there are made over whatever religions or whatever has existed, certain things that I feel are more adapted to me personally. And, if I find results, that then I would even dare to talk about it. It does not mean that the drug as an experience and the drug as given, that the interest in research could be carried on with LSD, I never will deny that.

I also think that this particular form of prejudice that you met with psychiatrists, psychologists and even the clergy and whatever, I think it is quite logical that they do not want to become interested in it because they are a little bit afraid of it.

But the fundamental question is really: What does one want with

it? Is it possible for a person to become conscious by means of drugs and then to be a different man? And it is still ~~examination~~ questionable when you say about these experiences as reported by sixty or seventy percent - how permanent was that experience? They make statements; and sometimes I think that a person having had an experience says, "I have become a changed man". That, of course, has been recorded many times and it can happen but it is quite seldom that it is permanent. I think that after a little while, when publicity or when the drug effects have done, let's say, their duty, that then again a man is placed in the surrounding where he came from, will probably take on again the same kind of color.

Question: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Nyland: It is not necessarily and I do not deny the possibility that someone under the influence of a tremendous shock, which perhaps a drug could provide, would be a changed person. But again, when he is a changed person, does he have the equipment which is necessary for the particular change to behave and to continue to behave as a man? A person may change from a man to become a saint. It is quite possible. And it may be that it is on account of some kind of a terrible or deep, intense experience.

Question: Saint Paul on the road to Damascus.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, whatever it is. That is an example. But then Saint Paul had something that he was going to pursue. And probably because of the opposition that he found, that was one of the fundamental aims for him which you might say fortunately he did not lose when he changed his name to Paul. ~~Mmwy~~ And how many actual cases of that; that actually one could indicate whatever has happened? Now, that in itself has nothing to do with what might happen with a development of our chemistry research. So I would almost say miracles surely could

happen at a certain time. I said a little while ago, "If you could find something that develops a I which is not effected by the drug but which would be present to the experience, someone having an experience of consciousness," it would be extremely valuable if that could be done in such a short time by means of a chemical.

Question: Well now, wait. Let me give you some more facts.

Mr. Nyland: -?- will not help very much because -?- in research the facts are not as yet sufficiently assorted and you do not know how permanent.

Question: You are going to like my facts so let me give them to you.

Mr. Nyland: I like the facts. I like the way you talk about it. I just want to tell you that I am not closed at all.

Question: I know that.

Mr. Nyland: Not at all.

Question: I know that or you would not be here with us tonight.

Mr. Nyland: Exactly.

Quostion: The facts that I was going to refer to were discouraging facts that we ran into early in our work. I must confess that I had a hope four years ago that a nervous system being what it is, that one brief experience, if/were well planned and well conducted, could pull out the old program from the computer and allow the person to substitute a new program that he could be a different person. And while it is true that a high percentage of people, after they took LSD, if it is given in a serious responsible circumstance, will report enthusiastically, glowingly. They will fill out check ~~item~~ lists that say, "My life is changed; I talked to God" and so forth and so on. But within a very brief period of time, they fall back, as you suggested, to their old environment and the old habits and the old machinery and robot work takes over . And they are right

back where they were, with a memory of a wonderful experience.

Mr. Nyland: ???

Question: After giving drugs to several hundred people once and collecting the data, questioning not just immediately afterwards, but follow up questions and observing in ourselves and in other people the reactions, we came to the conclusion that you would predict: that it is a very rare person who can accept an accidental or sudden experience of this sort and be a changed person. Of course, one of the things that kept us looking in those early days with some hope was that we were changed people, in the sense that it had changed us. It had completely changed our understanding of psychology. We saw psychology no longer as a matter of behaviour. We became dedicated to research in consciousness. Each day, as we learned more about the effects of these drugs, we were becoming different people. By studying spiritual works or classic works on consciousness, by talking to people, we were changing. But this again is a matter of our environment.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, and you may not know exactly if it was the results of the drugs or the result of the dedication.

Question: Exactly. ~~TM~~ An essential system developed among our group at Harvard in which anyone who came into it would have an experience and then he would have a chance to work on it. And that is all we talked about and that is all we have talked about I could say quite literally for the last four years. Most of us have been thinking about nothing else but this problem of conscious expansion. Okay, so we found that there was no brief magic cure. As a matter of fact, those of us who continued interest in this work have now spent three or four years on it. We have taken the drugs; I would say many of us on the average of ~~xxx~~ a hundred times -? close to our work. And

we would say that we are just at the beginning of learning how to maintain the effect of the expansion experience. You talked about and people accuse us of sponsoring a quick cure. We just have to laugh because four years of almost full time thought, writing, talk, experimentation and we fell we are just at the beginning; that the yoga of drugs or the work with the drug experience requires, as you pointed out, the constructing of some sort of a system, both mental and emotional and behavioural. So that you can work it out moment to moment, maintain it in your subsequent life. And that is why Ralph went down to a few ~~mmmtgimnix~~ meetings; and that is why all of us have been studying your work and the work of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky so much in a few months. But before we learned about ~~the~~ Gurdjieff, we had spent a great deal of time with other groups who are on the same path that we are on. As a matter of fact, I have worked somewhat with an Indian spiritual teacher; and I have been given admission to their group and I have learned such a tremendous amount from these people who have had four thousand years of experience. So, the question, I have to redefine my question. We agree with you completely that there is no quick road to enlightenment.

Do you have any advise to give us as yo how we might pursue our research in the furutre. If you assume, as we assume, that the drug experience can, if you are prepared, give you a glimpse of what is there. Have you any suggestions on how we could specifiy -?-

Mr. Nyland: Well, let's say it this way. How permanent is it at the present time? "hen you talked about being dedicated, that I would say is not a common ~~per~~ property but it is a property of man in general, that~~man~~ whenever they become dedicated to any particular kind of subject, they become a changed person. Take ordinary re-search in chemistry. I know well enough in working with a group of

people in order to develop something that is of value or use, to find out the structure of certain configurations of atoms or whatever it may be, to synthesize new products in order to let them have a property that you would like them to have. All of that, when you talk together with a group of people, all concentrated on that and with a sincere wish to try to solve it, will produce in each one of them and quite definitely in each individual who is seriously wanting to find out something, something in himself which is quite different from what he used to be.

Anyone who has an aim, even if you take an individual, will become quite a different person because, and we say it, "he is dedicated to that." I am sure it happens with ministers who are dedicated or maybe some missionaries who actually go out with the idea of wanting to help people. A doctor very often can be a dedicated person. It is not that there are so many of them but it is something that is, I say, not common but it is possible for a human being to be.

I think the difficulty is to find out that what it is that really makes my change. Is it my dedication to the wanting to pursue that particular aim at the cost of many things that I want to sacrifice? Is it the association with people who are thinking likewise, more or less creating an atmosphere in which I then start to breath? Is it something that starts to light up as a possibility for which one works and then, as it were, reflects on me while I am engaged in pursuing that aim? Or is it something that during that particular time I do to myself; let's say like Edison living in the laboratory and sleeping two hours and the rest of the time being occupied with that particular aim? All these are different factors, partly physical, partly psychological so that I really do not know what in particular or perhaps the

combination of all of them might produce in me a state which afterwards when I am engaged in it I say five or ten years I am an entirely different kind of a person. And I cannot trace, when all the different factors are active at a certain time, which factor it is that does it.

Now, I am not denying that the fact of taking drugs may help in that particular change. It may also be that if I have no time for anything else and I am devoted to doing this and that at the expense of not being able to go out and even spending ~~time~~ time on eating, that all I do is to have a little bit of bread and water, that perhaps that in itself, by eliminating all the other influences that I would usually have as an ordinary common person, that that might have a certain -?-.

You see, but it is still bagging the question because if I start to take one, let's say drugs, and I keep all of the other things the same in my ordinary work, that is, if I would take it while I am engaged in a business so as not to change too many factors, but I continue exactly by ~~fixing~~ leaving all the factors the same except one. Then, if there is a change, I would be able to attribute it/^{to} that,

That is, I think it is a very interesting theoretical question. When it is practical, it is practical for the person who wants to experience it. If it is possible for anyone, out of the totality of accumulated data of having drug experiences one on top of the other and a variety of people, that the psyche as it is at the present time with different people all taking let's say the same drug under the certain same conditions and everything else being equal, that then afterwards I might be able to find a certain law that applies.

I think that the probably error in this particular kind of research is tremendous because the attitude of people towards it, that

is, whatever they are as human beings is completely different. All of them unite on is to run an experiment on themselves but they bring to it whatever their personalities are. And, as soon as you introduce something that may be the same for ten people, the ~~ten~~ ten people will react, because of that, different as far as the permanency is concerned - not the immediate results. That is, the immediate effects are noticeable on every one the same way. The permanency will be determined by what he is before he started and what is his equipment with which he can work it up.

Question: Well, I have said that the third subject -?- important factor which determines what happens after the drug experience and that is environment or setting. In many reviews they use the term setting determines your experience -?- who you are when you come is of tremendous importance.

Mr. Nyland: Of course it is. That is why I say -?

Question: -?- in our -?- experience with conscious change or conscious expansion is most important. You can take a person who has this sort of personality and if he takes the drug in a psychiatric hospital where there are people running around with diagnostic tests and hooking him up with brain waves, he is going to have a psychiatric type experience because, during the drug experience your consciousness is so free it is very vulnerable to the suggestive magnetism of the surrounding; as tho you are free from your old mental set for this brief period and while your consciousness is kind of floating up, it can be pushed by any draft of wind almost. And when a heavy handed experimenter comes along or when the environment is heavy handed in any way it can direct the experience. We have tried in the last three years, very clumsily and ineffectually for the most part ~~ix~~ to see if we could study the effect of environment

in keeping the change permanent. For example in our Mexican experiments. We went to Mexico for two years and we tried to set up there an environment which was geared to keep people, as you said, objective or to try to keep them in a high point of consciousness all the time. And there we had, every morning and evening we would have different groups either planning their sessions or having a session or having meetings to discuss what happened during the session, to try to reconstruct it theoretically or verbally so that the atmosphere was permeated twenty four hours a day. And I mean twenty four hours a day because there were sessions at night, there were sessions at sunrise, there would be people just on the beach coming down from a session and there were three or four groups at the dining table working on their questionnaires and so forth. The atmosphere was just permeated with conscious expansion and its understanding. We found that there, of course people were on vacation; they were away from their jobs and their houses and their regular robot routine so that that had changed. We did find that in that protected environment we could maintain the effect of the drug longer and you could read it into your life more than you could in an ordinary situation. That requires of course that the person change his way of life. And I have said for a couple of years now that you have no right to give LSD to someone unless they are prepared to change their life and unless you are prepared to help them.

Mr. Nyland: Well, it is the same question if anyone says I want to become a priest. I also take out of my ordinary life, I give it up and I become a priest in a monastery, an acolyte and so forth and finally I will become a priest and maybe father confessor. I have a very special job to do then and I will be able to surround myself with an atmosphere or my own world in which I can function. It is

very much the same as people who go to church on Sunday and on Monday they have forgotton a little bit about their Christianity. Now, there is no objection for such people to want to do this - but let's come back to really what is the purpose of consciousness or the wish to acquire it. Is it to get away from certain states in which a human being lives in order to segregate oneself so that within that framework one could be entirely let's say happy for a moment? Or is the purpose of man to develop in whatever is at the present time apparently laid on him and where he finds himself, not to exclude himself from the rest of the world but to try to find a certain way by which he could remain a man in whatever he is doing and, at the same time, develop consciousness? It is a different way of looking at it. Question: This is the question that has been struggled with by all religious groups. Let's say the Catholic church has set up a hierarchy of the hermetical life where a person becomes a hermit and that essentially -?-

Mr. Nyland: Yes, but at the same time -?-

Question: -?- monastic community were people try to reconstruct an environment which is very elevating but which, as you say is completely divorced.

Mr. Nyland: It becomes more or less segregated and I select them with whom I want to deal. When I am a minister or a priest I surely have my little congregation. Regarding them I can become a father for them and help them - and to some extent I am quite limited. It is not the same at all to be an ordinary man going and buying some groceries and having dealings with so and so and financially working at an office and -?-

Question: -?- four children -?-

Mr. Nyland: Yes, whatever it may be. The whole point is what is really ones aim, in the first place of reaching consciousness? And

in the second place is that reaching of consciousness of any particular value regarding oneself for being a man as a man ought to be?

Question: Well, all of the religious leaders say the same thing; that the high points of Christian mysticism expected that the mystic would then come back and teach.

Mr. Nyland: ???

Question: Yes, in Buddhism after you are -?- you are supposed to return. -??-

Mr. Nyland: Exactly, that is the whole point because if you take the life of the mystics and those who have tried to write about it, whatever their experience was and then come back, there are probably very few who can actually relate whatever it was that they experienced and then also to be able to put it in such words that someone else can follow them and then also become a mystic. I do not know of any one of the Boehme group who became like Boehme.

Question: Who?

Mr. Nyland: Boehme, Jacob Boehme or any one of the mystics that you have do know who/created a following, who listen to them as long as such a person was alive who afterwards also become mystical. I do not know; maybe they do.

Question: Saint Therese.

Mr. Nyland: St. Therese, well, even there.

Question: She was great at starting monasteries but there is no evidence that she was ~~xxxxxxxx~~ able to ...

Mr. Nyland: And this is exactly the question of you might say human life.

Question: I would say that there is one person that stands out in modern history as being able to do that and I would say that is Gurdjieff.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I was not talking about Gurdjieff because I am only

looking at what is the desire to become conscious. This is an individual wish on the part of every person who is confronted with the problem of what am I now and could I become different from what I am. If the whole purpose of LSD experimentation has in mind to find a certain way by which a person can reach this particular perfection and evolution for himself it is wonderful. But I do not think you are on the right road.

Question: You do not know the road we are on yet.

Mr. Nyland: No, I do not think you are on the right road as yet. I think you put your emphasis on the wrong side.

Question: I would like to ask you a question concerning this, It might be considered on the cosmological level in the sense that, as I understand the work, one of the principles is that Earth itself is developing independently of any efforts that we might make on ~~ourselves~~ ourselves.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, according to Gurdjieff, yes.

Question: Now, assuming that and accepting that as a ~~xp~~ principle, do you think that that is incompatible with the work to see the possibility of something being introduced, some chemical being introduced via scientific investigation in the course of development of oneself which could facilitate this process for more people? You see, the nature of my question is -?-

Mr. Nyland: I know. After all, the development if the Earth, cosmologically speaking, is of a certain rate which belongs to the generality of the universe.

Question: Well, irrespective of the difference in time. I mean, I understand ...

Mr. Nyland: Well, that is exactly the point because the Earth at the present time, cosmologically again, is not what it should be.

Gurdjieff calls it an unfortunate planet. I think that there are conditions on Earth which ought to be eliminated in order for Earth itself to function as a planet. Now whatever is the purpose of mankind being on Earth, that is rather difficult. There can be theories about it and explanations and explanations which are more or less logical - but surely no proof. The proof is for oneself. After all I live on Earth. I can say, "Yes, that is true of Earth; because of that, I am what I am." Naturally, because I am on Earth, I am subject to the laws of Earth. And I can say I wished I was on Mars and I wished I was some where else and that ultimately maybe the Earth would become like a planet like Mars or like Saturn. It is quite possible. But that evolution is so tremendously slow that I cannot wait for it.

So, the only thing that I can do is to study myself for whatever I am and to discover that the state in which I am may be very comparable to the state of Earth. If it is possible for me this stage, seeing and knowing what I do and hoping and having intuition or perhaps a hunch of a possibility of a development within my lifetime, then I could become interested in that. I am not interested than any more in Earth. All I do is to accept the condition that I am on

Earth the way I am for whatever reason it is. And that I expect, if I understand this, that something in me can be born or continue to grow which apparently at the present time is not growing. This is really the fundamental question that we make a distinction between nature as we know it on Earth and as everybody of mankind experiences it and the possibility for man as he is to grow out into another state which is called self consciousness.

Question: But you can still accept the possibility of something being introduced into this sphere of what you call the "B" influence.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, yes, but you see there is something else. Gurdjieff makes a distinction between a conscious man and an angel. An angel is not a person that we know who can do. An angel is something that exists and helps support at the place where they are by means of a harp. It is not a conscious man. A conscious man is something that has grown up, exactly the same way as the body as grown up in stages, developing up to a certain point where it will not grow any higher and where perhaps there is also maybe a retardation gradually of that what already exists which, of course, is quite possible.

But his emotional development also goes up to a certain place and then his mind also goes up to a certain place and also stays. This is something that we must notice if we study man who, after a little while, loses his interest, his ideals, is satisfied by having a car in the garage and his family and a few friends and perhaps after ~~when~~ he gets a little older that he is not further interested to walk any more or that he is just happy to sit and have his slippers. It is exceptional when a man remains young. One can explain it and say, "Yes, that is the condition of Earth because he is approaching death."

The question is always how to avoid the possibility of death. This is a fact and it is much more a pragmatic fact that I first accept the condition in which I am and then see is it possible for me to continue to work gradually. The reason for that is simply that if I am all of a sudden transported into a state of higher consciousness, there is nothing of me to control that state and to return back again to wherever I wish to go further down below the line.

Question: I would like to talk to you about that. When we started our research, our first goal was to see if the setting is not

serious and responsible, a person can get distracted at the beginning of the drug session. He can get distracted with pleasure, he can get distracted with fear, he can get distracted with music and he may have a wonderful or a horrible time but it is taken -?- so that there is a high art and a complex science to helping a person get further out. And most of ~~xm~~ our work in the first couple of years was to see how to do it.

Mr. Nyland: How to guide it.

Question: Yes and so we have several thousand cases and we found out -?-

Mr. Nyland: Now wait, There was someone who was not taking the drug who was ~~gmit~~ guiding.

Question: It depends. Usually we had someone, one of the staff members take the drug and one of the staff members not take the drug.

Mr. Nyland: And the person who guided had not taken the drug?

Question: In some cases and in some cases they took a small amount of the drug.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, but how much more could they guide with or without the drug?

Question: Oh, they were able to guide. The way we have run sessions more recently the guide is almost like the conductor. Well, let me -?- . We experimented in all sorts of places. We went to the prison. We saw the prisoners not that we were doing things to the prisoners. It was a place where perhaps we could ~~xall~~ make -?- discoveries as a group, the prisoners with the Harvard group. And there were incidents in the prison in the beginning when we would have graduate students who did not have much experience with the drug becoming scared during the experience and the prisoner who had not experience would be there holding the Harvard psychologist and helping him thru it. So, the prisoner would become the guide which

we thought was an (? area to work in?) We were trying to eliminate these distinctions so that the prisoner could grow; helping the prisoner to grow. So that over the years we have developed methods whereby, with increasing precision, we can help a person decide ahead of time where he wants to go and we even use the metaphor of the symphonic score so that if you were to want to have a session now, it could be possible to run a session. We would have you work out a score for the three movements or the four movements of your eight hour session. It would all be carefully planned - the stimulation, the music, the readings, what would be presented to you so that at each block of time you would be able to go as far out, as high as you could in ~~an~~ ^{state of} ecstatic consciousness. And, as you started to come back down, it would all begin to gear in so that step by step you would come back, you would re-enter the planetary atmosphere not only where you wanted to be but also what kind of a person you wanted to be. Now, the Tibetan Book of the Dead was extremely useful because it is well known that they are not talking about physical death in that book. They are talking about the death of consciousness or the death of the ego; and the reincarnation is not necessarily on the cosmic level but you can reincarnate from this mystic experience that you have had. So, we learned a great deal from the Tibetan book and from Tibetan gurus that we talked to and used that as one of our models for guiding a person out as far as possible -? - and then coming thru the hallucinatory plaque in re-entering he could be guided thru that and then, when it comes to rebirth, how could he choose a womb, metaphorically speaking, and be any person he wishes to be. So, we got pretty good at that. I would say that we have more data and more (The recording ends in the middle of that sentence)

(There is apparently a discontinuity between the two recordings.)
... foreseeing the day ahead when you can by radar bring in a two hundred man jet plane. We are at the beginning of what we think is going to be a new approach to consciousness. But still, coming back to the question: How do you apply the fruits of your voyage, your internal voyage to your day to day life because we agree with you completely that no matter how great your flight, no matter how -?- your experience, how many planets you visited, -?- higher level of day to day living.

Mr. Nyland: If that is the purpose, yes.

Question: Let me just a minute. One of the experiments we tried was -?- the community, if a group of people who were dedicated to living at a high level, live together - could they do that? -?- in Milbrook and two situations in Boston, we have had what we call communities who attempted to do this. But again, in even this more protected environment where everyone at least consciously and voluntarily was dedicated to the goal, still it is extremely disappointing to see that the tendencies and the inertia to go back into the old robot and to think the same way and to live out the same life is still there. And even with drug experiences and the communities and the people who are -?- it is hell, almost impossible to get a glimpse of the possibility. But that is why we are so interested in learning more from you.

Mr. Nyland: You haven't lost hope have you?

Question: We haven't lost hope but we are interested to learn more.

Mr. Nyland: It is not a question of learning more. It is a question of learning a different principle because if consciousness is a state away from Earth and it is, because of that, away from subjectivity, I think it is necessary to learn what objectivity is. And as long as

you keep on using drugs, you use subjective means. You set certain things loose when you have a state of consciousness as exemplified by the people who have spiritual experiences which were probably way down in their essence somewhere because of the old education that they may have been exposed to and so forth. It is not something that simply came like manna from Heaven. I am sure that it was already in their psyche in some form or other and never came to the surface than only when they were dreaming.

But the question is if the conscious state is a state of freedom of what is the freedom? That is, what does one want to become free ~~or~~ from? From being a man? Or from being bound as a man? And it is much more important because that is really the principle that is involved because the question is: If I know how to loosen myself, I will also know how to bind myself. But there is something ...

Question: That is very well put.

Mr. Nyland: You understand what I mean. And I have to find out how to loosen. I cannot leave it to something else to loosen it for me. This, I believe, is quite fundamental regarding Gurdjieff. Gurdjieff calls it work on oneself - work. It is not just given. It is not something is like an atmosphere created which I happen to breathe in. For that, as far as nature, as far as we know it on Earth, is concerned, that is the limit. There is a limit to nature.

Question: Well, suppose it took ten years by using LSD to get to a state of objectivity - but suppose it could be done. We do not know but suppose it could be done. Would it be work?

Mr. Nyland: No, I do not think so because I think you are still dependent on something else doing the work for you.

Question: Drugs?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, or whatever it may be: conditions, general atmosphere, everything that you want to maintain.

Question: Iy is -???- nervous system though?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, it does come back to that. But, if I go to church I am effected by a beautiful Gothic cathedral and the colors of the stained glass windows and the organ and the music and all the things and so forth.

Question: It is all external.

Mr. Nyland: And still then, when I go out of the church, I remember it but it does not mean that I am religious. For a little moment I was touched. And maybe at such a time I even make up my mind that I want to be like that and that I want to be holy or whatever it is my ppiritual development; and then I see even visions of the possibility and I return to Earth. Supposing for a moment I am above it and I come back to Earth with all the memories that I have and I try to creatr around me even a church. And immediately I deal with so and so and he has absolutely no idea about church or about me or my state - and that is a man and my dealings are with him, even if it is close to me like my wife or family. How will they even know that I have had an experience of consciousness? And I am perfectly serious; I am really quite honest with myself. And I come to a point where I say, "Here I have had that experience; now I want to communicate it to you.

I do not know how to communicate and I do not know how even to maintain it because, together with all the different people that are surrounding me, I get constantly impressions from them which fall back again into that what I am really as a personality. And immediately I am caught. This is the big problem! That I am constantly caught. Only if I want to admit it, there is a possibility that I will see how to get out of it. But if I do not want to admit that I will flounder around. I call it in prison. Temporarily hallucinations or whatever it may be, high state of consciousness,

yes, I have no doubt that I can float every once in a while. But I lose contact with Earth and I hope, by God, that I can come down again.

Question: --?- prison.

Answer: ??

Question: --?- my own personal experiences may be a little bit related to what you are talking about. My reactions to reading just a little bit of Gurdjieff's system has been very enlightening in that there were things that, especially psychological things that I know to be true in my experience. The cosmology and the technical things I do not think I understood. But for the psychological stuff is real and I knew it to be true on that level. And there is one thing that appeared to be a contradiction in terms of Gurdjieff's system and the other mystical systems that I also know to be true. And I think it is an apparent contradiction, not a real one. I have not been able to formulate it within a kind of Gurdjieff thinking as to how it would be not a contradiction. Here is what it is. In the Gurdjieff system they make emphasis on work, a very active one. And the impression that I get is that to create a permanent I, a permanent state of control of oneself is cumulative but it starts from a state of relatively imprisonment or entrapped. Indeed, it is not there unless you work on it. And the purpose is that thru work, thru self remembering, thru awareness you build up a permanent I which you can work with on a much higher level. Now, in some of the other stuff, and recently I have been impressed with some of the Meher Babas writing which explained some of the experiences I have had very profoundly to me in a very lucid way. There seems to be the approach that indeed if one only knew it, if one could realize one could awaken, one would find that all these high levels of consciousness that come in on one, indeed even the Absolute or

whatever you call it, is within every Soul and individual if he only knew the techniques to break down ego or to embark upon a path which would help him to realize that in fact -?-. Now, you can see where I am not sure whether there is a contradictionl whether indeed you would say that the work in breaking down the ego or in working out obstacles to the path to the realization was indeed reall the same thing as the work in the Gurdjieff system where it appears that indeed man does not have this permanent I, does not have this high level of consciousness and must work to build it up as opposed to breaking down. Now, I wonder if you could /?-

Mr. Nyland: The question is: If one has absolutely nothing, one is not interested in waking up. The fact that I believe I may be asleep is that already something must be in me that starts to question my existence. When I am asleep, I have absolutely no idea about what a waking state is. When I start to question the possibility that perhaps there is something that I might call a waking state as against my sleeping state, waking-sleeping state, then there must be somethig in me that starts this.

But one can quibble about what it is. Sometimes religiously it is the voice of God. According to Gurdjieff it is called Magnetic Center. It is possible that philosophically it may be something that is a remnant of when a man was born which was left in him as life, which is very little developed and immediately is covered up by acquired characteristics. Still, at certain times, particularly when one is effected emotionally that a certain shock or something shakes one up, that one starts to question the validity of ones own life the way it is. And there is then/stimulated maybe partly by other people on the outside who, let's say, as really good friends tell one; partly by experiences of oneself seeing certain things happening

which one would like to have happen to oneself or whatever it may be. There has to be a motivation that I become interested in possible development. Gurdjieff claims that there is that only in a person that could become his individuality and that it is necessary for him to start working as well as he can, ~~xxxxxx~~ starting from this point with the material he has at hand.

The material that is at hand is a subjective form of material. Stimulated by that desire to become objective, I try to approach the possibility of what is it that is objective as against that what I find myself to be subjective. And, in the beginning, it is probably 99.99 percent subjective and very little objective. Very little because I do not know what objectivity is since I have to use all the things that are subjective functions for the purpose even of thinking about it.

But when I start to try to imagine a situation in which there is no opposite - for example, there are certain concepts like the concept of bliss which has no opposite. It is a state. When I say a state of consciousness, there is an absence of consciousness which I call unconsciousness if you wish. But, in any event, one can also say objectivity is that what is non-subjective and that what is subjective is not objective. There is a difference between the two, very much like night and day and very much like the wish I have for further growth and my ordinary activities of daily life.

So, when I start as it were from that inside out, wanting to work, I take whatever is available for me to work with. I hear about trying to become objective and I say, "Alright, if that is the state for me or possible for me, let me now try to become objective regarding myself if I possibly can." And now I use whatever subjective means I have. I have a mind which ~~xx~~ has a thought and has had a

concept of objectivity. It is an advantage because the mind has the possibility of seeing in the future as something that might happen which at the present time is still potential. I also say regarding that what is my body, I could perhaps become objective if I eliminate feeling.

So, immediately when I say my mind now becomes engaged in a certain process of wanting to become objective regarding myself, then I immediately start to think about do I know what is objectivity? I say & can I be objective regarding ~~xxxxxx~~ something else? I find that I must be objective regarding something else when I am not involved in it emotionally. Scientific studies are very good for objectivity because there are facts and facts have a certain reason of existence regardless of my interpretation or my liking.

Many times I compare it with a study of a certain new substance that, according to my theory, has to boil at 159 and I test it and it boils at 157. Well, the structure that I have in mind is something that I am very close to and is very dear to me because it either confirms a theory I have or it does not. The fact remains that it is 157. The acknowledgement that I have to make regarding that is I was not objective because I could not know how. The fact is that it is boiling at that point; therefore the objective fact remains for me: it is 157 - and I accept it.

Whenever it comes to the question of being objective about myself, it is much more difficult. The difficulties a judge has to become objective regarding ~~xx~~ expressing a sentence or whatever it is that he metes out to some kind of a criminal is already extremely difficult for him because he is sympathetic or not. He cannot have his feelings play a certain part when it has to do with certain facts. At the same time, he has to consider also reasons and

motivations for a certain something happeneing.

But when it comes to myself and I try to see myself as I am, that is, I try to become objective even to very simple things like movements of my body or a gesture or a tone of voice, immediately when I hear it or when I become aware of it, I have already on my shoulders something like an emotion or a feeling regarding it or I have something in my mind regarding it that I want to recognize it and give it a name. I like it or I dislike it. In any event, it is difficult for me to become extremely, let's say, extremely neutral.

At the same time, if I pursue an aim of wanting to have an experience of objectivity, I start out with my mind having to function in a certain way without allowing my feeling to come in; my body doing certain things which do not require any liking or disliking. And that the only motivation that I can say ought to be there as far as my feeling is concerend is my wish to be objective.

It is quite logical that I must start with very simple things and it is also logical that in order to become impartial, that is, eliminating my feelings, I have to understand that neither my thought processes or my feeling processes can enter into that particular activity because they are constantly colored either by my mind or by my heart as a past or as an anticipation.

So real impartiality must be dependent on a moment of time of experiencing that form of behaviour. These are the three fundamentals for work on oneself. To become objective, to accept things as they are and to be aware at the moment when it, my body or whatever it is, happens. The study first is to take what is apparently a little easier than the other things - that I become, if I can, objective regarding the functioning of my body only so that I already

try to eliminate feelings and thought processes than only that my mind starts to function in its original subjective way but now trying to acquire a faculty of an objective kind regarding my body since my body is practically all of it that I can see and it would be a little easier to become aware of it. And it is not necessary all the time to have my feelings play a part in my body, neither my mind because there are times in which my feelings and my mind can be separated from my body because my body can be absolutely quiet; it does not have to have any activity and it does not have to have any motivation as coming from either mind or feeling to become active.

So then, when I say to my body, "Walk", and I now become aware of myself walking, this fact, which is my body walking, is registered in a certain part of my brain and I call that an objective part or at least an objective registration of it. That it is difficult I know because I do not live in a moment. The moment passes, another moment, another moment. As soon as I say it is a moment is is already past so I cannot use any thought form regarding the determination of a moment.

I have to use another form; something that is also a mental function. I call it awareness because an awareness is registered at a moment ~~without~~ without having to put it in words. Some people are able to do that a little easier than others. At the same time, whenever I have had an experience of a certain consciousness, if I remember it right, that is, if I do not embellish it and I do not try to re-interpret it, but if I remember it right, I remember that at that moment I was not thinking or feeling. This, of course, is an experience that one must again check and constantly all these things have to be checked with an experience to see that one stays

on the right road.

The result is this: that I acquire gradually a certain way of seeing and looking at myself quite unusual and a little closer to objectivity. And in the development of that what I call a faculty which now starts to grow independently of my other functions of my mind, then I know by dexterity having acquired a certain way of how to use this kind of a method, I can extend it to observing my feeling center, whatever it is as a center, feelings as they happen and my mind as it functions in a thought process, associative or whatever it may be.

These are difficult steps to take. And it is a long time before one actually could go and change the object of objectivity from the body to an emotional center, to a thinking center. But there is a little bridge which is possible since the emotions are noticed in behaviour forms of the body and since mind questions very often lead to activity of the body; that by seeing the activity of the body and becoming impartial to it, I can trace the source. It is a different way of developing but in any event, there is that possibility.

Regarding the question of developing the faculty, it takes a long time because I know that when I am awake or aware of myself, that because of my wish to put things in worse, my wish not to make the effort to eliminate a thought or a feeling, I fall back in ordinary life and immediately I start to philosophize about it or start to associate it with something that has to do with approaching work without working.

The difficulty ^{is} /that I must continue to make an effort because effort means that I am introducing ~~something~~ into my subjective life something that does not belong to it. Objectivity does not belong

to man as he is. I think this is a statement that can be verified by anyone who honestly tried. Also it is quite subject to verification that as soon as I try to become aware, that I lose it and that if I continue to make an effort, it may be possible to sustain it. That it may not be as intense at certain times as at other times, that also there is a difference between darkness and light in the form of twilight, that I am as much in this particular direction subject to a development which is slow and gradual. But that again I would say is in the nature of the case or it is in the Great Nature as it were.

When I say Great Bature I mean that what is after nature. That ~~is~~ what is ~~at~~ the present time personality is natural. That what is potential and can grow out into what a man ought to become is Great Nature. That belongs to a different sphere. It does not belong to Earth. It ~~him~~ belongs to that what surrounds us you might say outside of our atmosphere, perhaps belonging to a planetary level, perhaps belonging to a solar level. But whatever the characteristic is, ^{make much difference} it does not ~~matter~~ what I call it.

It is an experience that I have and can verify that when I am objective, when I for one moment, two moments, a second, maybe a little longer, sustain an effort to remain as it were with part of me observing a certain part of my which continues to live, then I solve the problem of being able to separate something from me while that what continues in life as man remains. When I once have this experience, that it is possible to separate and to have an experience of being on that level and, at the same time remaining on Earth, then I have solved the problem for myself and all I say is I need practise.

If I now continue to do this, I develop two things. One is an objectivity and a faculty which at the present time is located in my mind in a certain place where it can be developed. In the second

place, I develop something which is possible because of a different kind of food which enters me and when I am awake is used and digested in a different manner, it builds within something that did not exist and makes grow out, in the first place, the possibility of an emotional body.

Question: What is that?

Mr. Nyland: Emotional Body = a body within a body. Kestjan it is called. So that that body ~~xxxxxx~~ gradually becomes a body which starts to govern as parallel to the existence of my physical body. That there is another step regarding the possibility of development of Soul Body within the Kestjanian Body, fulfilling certain functions which a Kestjan Body cannot do because that only has to do with emotional states. The Intellectual Body or Soul Body, as Gurdjieff indicates, is something that develops as an intellectual body. With all this, the experience that I have by simply trying to become aware of myself performing certain ordinary behaviour forms without having to become partial to them. I select out of the behaviour forms I have five different kinds: walking - a movement, gesture, posture, tone of voice, facial expression. These are five things that I know belong to my personality which are constantly in use as it were, which constantly could become observed if there was something to observe them with. And that the development of that what is now gradually taking place as a body, a second one and then the third one, gradually will make and give me the opportunity of something belonging to me but not being identified with ~~it~~ me.

This belongs to a state of consciousness which I do not know until I start. When I start and have an experience that I am conscious, I experience something out of this world. And this I can constantly verify because I know how to open the door. That this

requires constant effort, that means fighting all the time against existing conditions, that I am physically and psychologically subject and remain subject to the law of gravity of Earth, it goes without saying because that is what I am as a human being.

At the same time, there is a hope because there at times the possibility that I am free and altho there are many things that bind me, I will say after a while one and another and another and another - dependent on how much wish I have, how much understanding I have which is the knowledge of a method being converted, by means of an experience, into an understanding of a kind which is not, as I say, of this Earth.

That it is necessary to remain impartial; that it is necessary to understand moments instead of time, that it is necessary not to be fooled by means of my memory, that it is necessary not to be fooled by expecting and hoping something will exist; and I start to discover it in a subjective manner when I start to deal with objectivity. Yet at the present time I do not know what objectivity is because I am not living there; that I do not know how to prepare myself even for consciousness because I am unconscious - all of that is true. But when there is once the possibility that I can open the door and see something can be possible for me, then I will work.

Question:-? - That helps a lot. Do you regard the question as to whether one -?- ones model; the work for discovering a model as opposed to the work for accumulation of control of conscious. -?- really that is kind of irrelevant. Do you think -?- effect ones approach to work?

Mr. Nyland: Do you mean the method of how one does it?

Question: No, how one goes about thinking or considering whether his work and try to let's say in the work mix&mix&jxx-?- as you described it. Now I guess it really cannot be considered or the model does not fit; that the work is the work of uncovering possibilities and

and attaining that which ...

Mr. Nyland: The question is if it already exists and that I uncover it or is it something that has to grow?

Question: Right.

Mr. Nyland: One can quibble about that because Ouspensky sometimes claims that higher emotional center, in Gurdjieffian terminology, exists and so does higher intellectual center. I think that the quibbling is that the center is not a body and Gurdjieff quite definitely talks about development of a body; also makes the statement that Soul does not exist.

If you know about an octave, Do Re Mi Fa Sol La Si Do, that octave represents physical body. Do Re Mi represents the beginning of Emotional Body and is parallel to the Sol La Si of physical. So that at the height of Si Do, Fa of the second octave appears; that the third octave starts at Fa, at the height of Fa with Do; and that the totality of man is Do Re Mi Fa Sol La Si, not Do because then he would die, Do Re Mi of Emotional and Do of Intellectual.

If you connect the Si Do and Fa and Do with a line, below that as a triangle is man as he is. It is an unconscious area. Above the lone is the conscious area. The possibility of development of man is the loosening of Si Do for freedom; death, you might say, to physical body; the overbridging of the Do Re Mi of Kesdjan, that is the second part, into Sol La Si of its own as a possible development of his Emotional Body to its end at Si Do; and the freedom that could be given for that body depends on the development of Intellectual Body starting at Do Re Mi, running parallel to Sol La Si of Emotional Body, bridging its own Fa, the third octave; and then helping Si Do to free itself from Kesdjan and running up Sol La Si of its own Intellectual Body.

So, even if I say higher emotional center and higher intellectual center exist, what is required is the development of such a center into a body or the completion of that what has been given as a fundamental note, into something that makes it a complete octave,

The reason for that simply is that an octave can be reduced to a point so that, if I understand moments, that I can understand a moment as a result of something that exists without dimension or the result of something that was one or two or three dimensions being reduced, telescoped to one point again. So that if Do is struck in one, that the function of Do is to strike one octave higher, simply means that the totality of ones life is comprised between the two Do's. And that the fundamental question of being able to ~~xxxxxx~~ go up means that the Do reaches the ~~xxxxxx~~ second Do and then has become one and, at that moment, no more dimensions. It has no further function to fulfill. It is death of physical body.

Kesdjan, starting with Do Re Mi, has to complete Sol La Si. According to Gurdjieff, the first octave represents man number one, two or three, indicating by that his particular functioning as far as physical, emotion and intellect, simply considering that the totality of forms of behaviour of man can be more or less segregated into three main functions. Man number four is Do Re Mi of Kesdjan. Man number five is Sol La Si of Kesdjan. Man number six is Do Re Mi of Intellect. Man number seven is Sol La Si of Intellect. Regarding the permanency and the temporary: Whenever I cross Fa, I become permanent. Whenever I am in Do Re Mi, I am Do Re Mi - Mi Re Do. It is a triangle which I constantly keep on running around the sides and I cannot get out of it.

I must get out of it by means of something that helps me to overbridge Fa. Unfortunately, Fa is one and a half as compared to the Do Re Mi. The initial Do has an impetus which brings me up to

Mi and I run back. My energy has run out at that point. I need additional energy to overbridge Fa which is one and a half notes. It is called an outside shock. It is something that happens because of outside circumstances allowing me, very much like when physical body develops and it reaches its own Fa, at that moment air enters to help the functioning, digestive processes and so forth of the phsycial body to maintain itself up to the point of Si.

Kesdjan is subject to the same laws. It has its Fa. It is supplied by the Do of Intellect but the Do of Intellect has no dimensions. If the Do of Intellect could become conscious - it means this: That whenever an impression reaches a human being and he is aware, that is, awake, the impression as energy goes into a different place, in a different direction than the usual one. One might say it is subconscious. One might say it is Magnetic Center. It does not matter. In any event, there is something that takes place which is different. And it is this Do, when an impression is made so called conscious, that is, when the recipient is awake that then the Fa of the Kesdjan Body can be overbridged and he will then be able to go thru Sol La Si of that development parallel to the Do Re Mi of Intellect.

Do Re Mi of Intellect is work. It is work in a conscious area. It is work on oneself. Do represents observation which includes impartiality and simultanaity. It is the little triangle within the Do. Re for that particular octave happens to be called participation. Participation means I am awake and I return to Earth to participate in my activity, whatever the activity may be. Mi in that octave is experimentation. It means I am observant, I am awake, I am participating in my usual form of behaviour and I will include experiment-

ing

in the unusual forms of behaviour form with which I was not familiar, which I now need in order to become more whole or more fully developed.

The question of Fa of Intellectual Body is very difficult because that is reversly stimulated by the question of Si Do which is at the same level belongint to an Emotional Body. Si Do is difficult because it is a compact arrangement since it is only half a note. Thaht is, there is such tremendous pressure above this particular condition, very much like the Si Do of physical body is compact, not wanting to give up when it dies; that exactly the same condition is with Si Do of Ksedjan. And, because of its emotional quality, it has to attack by an emotional state.

Gurdjieff calls this Intentional Suffering and Voluntary Work. That what I then create, beased on the experimentation as represented by the note Mi of the Intellectual Body, now wants to create conditions in which I know I will suffer simply for the sake of trying to remain conscious. It is a condition, as I say, which has to start from Si Do of Emotional because it is an inner condition. It is then that this inner condition produces an outside shock for the Intellectual Body to develop further to man number seven!

Man number five is permanent regarding man number four because he has to has to overbridge Fa, cross Fa and he will never return again to Do. Man number seven is permanent regarding man number six. In the ~~xxx~~ of six, intellectually I can be shaken. I may not be able to sustain sufficiently long. All kinds of questions will come up which will throw me and I will not be intellectually convinced that even the road to objectivity is the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ only one. When I am in seven, I know. At that time, there is no further doubt.

Now read, read more in Beelzebub. Try to read it now with a little different -?- what I have said. And then you will start to understand

that there is something that is very very fundamental because it is based on the acceptance of the condition of man. It is an understanding of man. That is, whatever his limitations are and in whichever way he is bound by his own subjectivity, that for objective purposes he has to understand them first; then to know where he is bound; then to introduce a method by which he is going to conquer. He will not know until he knows how strong the enemy is before he will be able to produce an army~~s~~ of his own. But the army has to be built, the army has to be trained. There have to be officers. There has to be someone in command. This is I.

Together with the development of a faculty of objectivity in ones mind, emotional center also partakes by means of Magnetic Center. And in development of this kind, Magnetic Center consists of two cells which split off; one going to the emotional center; the other to the intellectual center. The constancy of work has energy being received, as I say, as a conscious impression which really means that the impression being received in a conscious state, and the conscious state is a state of objectivity which one tries to maintain and tries to make, is already reflected in whatever one might do; that one could eliminate one thoughts and feelings by being complete regarding that what one does.

In that state, the three centers become one, even if for one moment and as such do not exist any longer. But in their place will be a state of being. The state of being becomes importatn because that is afterwards the possibility where I can live. I will not live in any one of the three centers. It does not belong there.

Question: How frequent, it is a ridiculous question, but it is just part of the game. How often, how many men in a generation, how many men alive today do you think have reached this?

Mr. Nyland: -? - You see, I am interested in working and I am interested in reaching a state of consciousness. If it is possible -

Question: But you are teaching and as a teacher -? -

Mr. Nyland: Why should I tell people so and so and so and so and that there are so many? What difference does it make?

Question: But you would like to see this number increase.

Mr. Nyland: Naturally.

Question: Now, many people who take LSD and then look around to find some way to get back or to apply or to understand the experience they have had. And, in the past, we have referred these people to the great writings of the mystics. Recently we have been urging everyone that we talk to and that we write to to read Gurdjieff and to read Ouspensky and we encourage many people to attend the meetings in New York and Boston. Now, do you have any objection to our doing this?

Mr. Nyland: Not at all because as soon as they start to discriminate for themselves they will find out what is worthwhile and what is not. It does not make any difference as far as I am concerned what anyone else wants to do.

Question: But you are concerned -? -

Mr. Nyland: No. I want to be absolutely sure that one understands what is meant by the Gurdjieff teaching. No more. I am only interested in presenting the teaching exact. I hate for anyone who does not do that. As far as working ...

Question: What do you mean?

Mr. Nyland: Because it is subject to mis-interpretation.

Question: You want to see it presented exactly?

Mr. Nyland: I want it to be presented in an exact scientific form.

Question: Isn't it changing? Doesn't it get -? -. If Gurdjieff had been alive wouldn't he change it himself?

Mr. Nyland: No, no. I think these are fundamentals. They are fundamental concepts. I do not think they even belong to Gurdjieff. I think they are fundamental to any kind of religion where the religion has become alive.

Question: You do not think that the system and the methods will continue to change?

Mr. Nyland: No, not the principles.

Question: It is hard for me to accept that.

Mr. Nyland: Why?

Question: Well, reading about Einstein; Einstein's theories do not reject Newtonian theory because you cannot reject Newtonian theory and the law of gravitation holds within certain -?- space-time. What -?- Einstein's theory is that it incorporates all the known and verified facts of Newton and then expanded them and put them into a new space-time dimension.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, but we are talking about esoteric knowledge. We are not talking about ordinary knowledge. . .

Question: Of course. I know, but -

Mr. Nyland: That always is the same.

Question: You talked about the effectiveness of methods. Have you kept track of people that have gone thru your school? -?- effectiveness of the method on them?

Mr. Nyland: If it has happened?

Question: Yes, -?- have you kept record of -?-

Mr. Nyland: No, I do not keep records. That is their business.

Question: And you don't think it makes a difference how many people you have reached, to how many people you can convey this ecstatic experience to?

Mr. Nyland: I think it is quite necessary to reach as many as possible.

That I believe in.

Question: So, in the -?- wouldn't you say that any means to achieve this, to reach these people that are-?-. It doesn't really matter how you reach them, does it, if you can give~~m~~ them consciousness?

Mr. Nyland; It surely does matter.

Question: We could make a bargain now. We could continue our work and we could stimulate more interest in the general business of esoteric development and spiritual growth and then we could send people to you and then you could -?- on the road. But some of them will stay around and you -?-

Mr. Nyland: I do not know. I do not know how far they go on the road of LSD.

Question: But -?- we are on the wrong road?

Mr. Nyland: I am afraid that if they do come and they have been, lets say, effected, I would probably have ~~x~~ more difficulty to tell them that they are on the wrong road. It depends on a persons prejudice.

Question: But you have not told me about the effectiveness of the number of people that have been with you, that have worked with you. Have you -?- humber of years and they have gone back to the old traps or have they changed -?-

Mr. Nyland: I would be one person you could ask - have I changed? And the answer is yes. Now, if you want to ask someone else who has been exposed, ask him. Im answer of course would be prejudiced.

Question: But you were criticizing the method.

Mr. Nyland: Which method?

Question: You were talking about drugs that -?- permanent -?-

Mr. Nyaldn: ~~xx~~ -?- ask is it permanent? And I simply say that I do not think that it touches the right point.

Question: Well, what that means ~~xx~~ to you is that if it is effective for you, it does not matter who else it concerns where it might

be effective?

Mr. Nyland: Why?

Question: That is what you are saying.

Mr. Nyland: Not at all.

Question: That is what I understood.

Mr. Nyland: -?-- what I said. -?-- Of course not. Naturally, who should I even try to talk about it. There may be two reasons. One is that I really have an idea that it could be communicated; and the other is maybe I do it for selfish reasons in order to have a chance to talk about it. But, there may be a third reason: that if I am actually interested in my own development, that perhaps there is a point at which I should teach; that I am dependent to that extent on teaching for my own -?--.

But that is all beside the point. Do I remain interested in those who listen? Do I become interested in them to see that they continue in the direction in which I think they should go? Do I, at certain times, help them to straighten them out if I think they have done the wrong thing or if they do not understand it? And that, of course, shows that I am interested in whoever listens and wants to listen. It is a human quality you might say. Why is really the reason that I am uninterested as a whole, that I want to do it? In the first place I believe in it. In the second place I think it can be helpful. In the third place I believe it ought to be maintained. Two many esoteric knowledges, as it were, have gone down, down the drain. They have disappeared. This is true of all civilizations and you know it. And, for that reason, I like to have at least my hand in the possibility of trying to maintain it as long as possible without personal interpretations. It will all come - I am quite certain. After a couple of generations people probably will have forgotten

about Gurdjieff. I would hope; I like to keep it on a certain level as long as I can in order for others, if they can, to be in contact with it and to profit by it, which I think they can if they want to and if they really wish.

Question: We have been concerned about that fact too. When you look over history, you realize that each time an esoteric teaching has been expressed, within one or two generations it is either lost or what is worse, it is maintained in a static form so that the husk of the message is there but the seed has withered. That is one way of looking at it. The other way of looking at it is, as you say, the esoteric -- must be the same and maybe every few generations it has to come back in a new form so that perhaps what Gurdjieff was saying and teaching has been said by people a few generations back and that there is a continual process of evolutionary progress. -? - of the life energy being transformed into human manifestation. But, at one point, we thought it was likely that - you see, we believe the same way about psychedelic drugs as you believe in Gurdjieff's teaching. I think they have tremendous use to awaken man and to help him in the waking state. We got discouraged sometimes in the past about whether it is possible that a knowledge of these drugs could pass away, because the Indians in Mexico used them before the Spanish came. And the Spanish church wiped it out - bit not quite, not quite because the reason I am here tonight is because the Spanish did not quite wipe it out entirely. And there are little pockets in the mountains, little villages where they do not speak Spanish. They still speak the old -?-. Generation after generation kept it alive and one day a friend of mine, an anthropologist, who knew one of these Indians -? - in Mexico. We have felt that the message continually would be that after -? - flicker of the original process and that ? it is ambitious to say perhaps. but we think that that's possibly this new

development, the chemical way of awakening people might be the next method, the next technique and it in turn will change -?- it will be something now. Maybe it will be new forms of electricity. Each year, each month almosy, neurologists are discovering more about the electricity of the brain and they can now, with a radio, control changes of consciousness in other species, in monkey. And they can -?- wide variety of hunger and thirst and even some mysterious -?- center which they call the pleasure center which they really do not understand. We have on our wall, we have -?- chart of age -?- percentage of the number of people that can hear what we have to say now. And I would say that we are really concerned or really have more people to listen -?- less than thirty or even less than twenty five. At Harvard, you can see that the graduate students had a system and they were fixed, most of the,. The professors were completely fixed. They were so asleep in our perspective that you could never wake them up. But the undergraduates listened more than the graduate students. Of course, for legal reasons and for ploitical reasons they could hot be part of our research. But the way -

Mr. Nyland: They were mor open.

Question: Yes. The way we see it going we think that within three or four years, according to the time table we are working on, there will be literally over millions of people who will be using psychedelic drugs as a way of openin; consciousness. And if we -?- our contract tonight, we have not worked out ways of doing -?- after we do this. We will try to send more and more of them to you. So that -?-

Mr. Nyland: I do not know. Unfortunately, I cannot look in the future. You see, we all try. What is the time?

Question: Ten.

Mr. Nyland: It gets to be time -?- children.

Question: Did you have dinner Mr. Nyland:

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I had something. All of us had something to eat as they call it. -?- we can go without.

Question: I think you will accept the possibility that many many people are asleep because of the nature of social realities. It becomes -?- carried on -?- social and educational systems. If it is possible to alter the structure of learning, environment -?- so that the people are more -?- to be influenced, if you will, at an earlier age in our literature. Is this compatible with the work?

Mr. Nyland: Well, the sooner a person could learn about it, that is, know about, it would be a little easier. I think you would have to start quite early but not too early because, regarding work, it is necessary to have ammunition. If a person has not lived long enough when he is very young, he does not ~~xxxx~~ know really what friction is. So, there is a certain age I think at which perhaps this kind of knowledge also can be introduced. I think, as far as the teaching is concerned, it is not a question of acquisition of knowledge. It is a question of doing.

Question: Suppose you started at an earlier age -?- at Fontainbleau wasn't Gurdjieff working with children?

Mr. Nyland: I would not call it young children that he was working with. They happened to be around.

Question: But he did work with them?

Mr. Nyland: Oh no. They did movements. That, you might say, is a form of work. -?- consisted of three different directions, as you probably know, an intellectual one, and an emotional one and a physical one. And the children can be taught the physical means by certain definite movements. You can call it gymnastics and you can call it sacred dances. They are of a certain kind and they have very definitely a certain effect. They are not like ballet. They are quite unusual.

Question: Are there more psychological techniques? For example, in Huxley's Island, in the course of the novel he takes someone thru the school. And subjects that are taught there include a subject called -?- control -?- children learn self remembering in a sense at a very early age. They observe themselves. -?- pain. They learn how to control their own nervous system.

Mr. Nyland: I do not think they do, if you ask me. I think they talk about it and they become aware of something existing. But surely they are not impartial.

Question: Do you think that in the ideal society run by, say, where all the teachers were well trained students of Gurdjieff, that the task could be facilitated at a younger age?

Mr. Nyland: Oh yes, without doubt, without doubt. Anyone who would be a Gurdjieffite, if you want to call it that way, could have a very definite influence on children.

Question: -?- think so. Of course Huxley was influenced by Gurdjieff and I think a lot of the ideas in Island,

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I think he was at times. He was not -?-.

Question: You might say that he corrupted them but I think you can trace the line.

Mr. Nyland: No, I do not think he corrupted them. I think he did not understand ~~the~~ it quite. Many times I am sure it will happen more and more that people will start to write about Gurdjieff and start to reinterpret in accordance with whatever they have known or so called experienced. And then they love to hear themselves talk also. And very often they would like to indicate that they are very well read and they bring in a little Zen and a little bit of someone ~~else~~ else, you know. If they possibly can refer to Schopenhauer and Kant in the same breathe, it would be wonderful. But, you see, it is not

.....

(Recording ends)